



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,198	09/18/2006	Hans Lovgren	B&LAB 3.3-026	7410
530 7590 12/19/2008 LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090				
EXAMINER HUG, ERIC J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/19/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/593,198

**Applicant(s)**

LOVGREN, HANS

**Examiner**

Eric Hug

**Art Unit**

1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2007 and 18 September 2006.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 September 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/25/08, 6/25/07, 9/18/06  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ ~~Notice of Informal Patent Application~~  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "the upper table" in. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The upper table is referred to only as a first dewatering table in the parent claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Santos (US 5,783,045).

Santos discloses a twin-wire former for manufacturing paper. The former (Figure 1) comprises upper 24 and lower 22 endless wires which are brought together to form a wedge-shaped dewatering space in between. The lower wire travels around rolls and over a lower

dewatering table 32, and the upper wire travels around rolls and under an upper dewatering table consisting of auto slices 44, 46 and a saveall 48 for drawn-off water (see column 4, lines 1-7 and Figure 2A). Downstream of the wedge-shaped dewatering space, the twin wires are conveyed through a series of S-rolls 52 and press rolls 58 for further dewatering and pressing of the web in between the wires. The rolls are arranged in a frame 72. The auto slices and saveall are adjustable by hand wheel 50 for vertical positioning. Figure 2A shows a link between the second auto slice 46 and the frame.

Thus regarding claim 1, Santos discloses the claimed twin-wire press for dewatering of a fiber suspension, comprising an endless lower wire that runs around lower rolls, an endless upper wire that runs around upper rolls, first (upper) and second (lower) dewatering tables which support the respective upper and lower wires, a wedge-shaped dewatering space between the wires for initial pressing and dewatering, a roll arrangement positioned after the dewatering tables for final pressing and dewatering, and a frame for the roll arrangement. Santos further discloses a hand wheel which reads on the claimed lift arrangement for vertically adjusting the first dewatering table, and a link between the second auto slice and the frame which reads equivalently on the claimed link system joined at one end to the press frame and joined at the other end to the upper section of the first dewatering table. This combination enables the first dewatering table to be moved in a vertical direction from and against the second dewatering table.

Regarding claim 2: The hand wheel corresponding to the claimed lift arrangement is attached to the press frame at one end and to the first dewatering table at another end.

Regarding claim 4: The hand wheel corresponding to the claimed lift arrangement is attached to the front projecting section of the press frame at one end and to the upper portion of the first dewatering table at another end.

Regarding claim 7: The link arm in Figure 2A is shown as having one end that is pivotally arranged in a joint at the first dewatering table, and having a second end pivotally arranged in a joint at the press frame.

Regarding claim 8: Although only one side of the twin-wire former is shown in the Figures, it is deemed that the former must comprise lifts and links on both sides of the machine to provide proper vertical separation of dewatering tables.

Regarding claim 9: The first dewatering table is an upper dewatering table and the second dewatering table is a lower dewatering table.

2. Claims 1-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sbaschnigg et al (US 6,338,773).

Sbaschnigg discloses a twin-wire device for dewatering a pulp suspension. The device comprises upper 4 and lower 5 endless wires which are brought together to form a wedge-shaped dewatering space in between. The lower wire travels over a lower dewatering table 11, and the upper wire travels under an upper dewatering table 10. Downstream of the wedge-shaped dewatering space, the twin wires are conveyed through a series of S-rolls 21, 22 and press rolls 25, 26, for further dewatering and pressing of the web in between the wires. The rolls are arranged in a frame. The upper dewatering table is vertically adjustable relative to the lower dewatering table via hydraulic tube 14 supplied at point 15 with pressurized air or fluid. Stop

screws 16 provide minimum and maximum adjusting distance between upper and lower dewatering tables. A cantilevered support 18 is provided at the top of the dewatering table and at the top of the frame. See the Figures and column 2, lines 39-46.

Thus regarding claim 1, Sbaschnigg discloses the claimed twin-wire press for dewatering of a fiber suspension, comprising an endless lower wire that runs around lower rolls, an endless upper wire that runs around upper rolls, first (upper) and second (lower) dewatering tables which support the respective upper and lower wires, a wedge-shaped dewatering space between the wires for initial pressing and dewatering, a roll arrangement positioned after the dewatering tables for final pressing and dewatering, and a frame for the roll arrangement. Sbaschnigg further discloses a hydraulic tube which reads on the claimed press and lift arrangement for vertically adjusting the first dewatering table, and a cantilevered support which reads equivalently on the claimed link system joined at one end to the press frame and joined at the other end to the upper section of the first dewatering table. This combination enables the first dewatering table to be moved in a vertical direction from and against the second dewatering table.

Regarding claim 2: The hydraulic tube arrangement corresponds to the claimed lift arrangement. It is attached to the press frame at one end and to the first dewatering table at another end.

Regarding claim 3: The lift arrangement is clearly arranged in the vicinity of a front edge of the first dewatering table.

Regarding claim 4: The hydraulic tube arrangement corresponds to the claimed lift arrangement. It is attached to the front projecting section of the press frame at one end and to the upper portion of the first dewatering table at another end.

Regarding claim 5: Stop screws 16 read on the claimed stop member. It is shown as being arranged on a surface of the press frame in the space between the press frame and the front edge of the upper table, opposite the upper table.

Regarding claim 6: The lift arrangement is a hydraulic cylinder (tube).

Regarding claim 7: The cantilevered support is shown as having one end that is pivotally arranged in a joint at the first dewatering table, and having a second end pivotally arranged in a joint at the press frame.

Regarding claim 9: The first dewatering table is an upper dewatering table and the second dewatering table is a lower dewatering table.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sbaschnigg et al (US 6,338,773) in view of Eickhoff et al (US 6,003,684).

The twin wire press of Sbaschnigg is described above. Regarding claim 8, although only one side of the twin-wire press is shown in the Figures, it is deemed that the twin-wire press

comprises cantilevered supports on both sides of the machine or across the width of the machine to maintain uniform separation of the dewatering tables. Eickhoff is cited here to provide additional details of the hydraulic tube. Eickhoff discloses the identical twin-wire belt press as shown in Figure 1 of Sbaschnigg. Referring to Figure 2 of Eickhoff, the tube extends across the width of the dewatering table, therefore it is on both sides of the twin-wire press. It is deemed that the twin-wire press of Sbaschnigg has the same arrangement.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Odmark et al (US 7,051,882) discloses a twin-wire belt press with upper and lower dewatering tables connected to a press frame.

Csordas et al (US 3,929,065) discloses a twin-wire dewatering unit with a vertically adjustable upper dewatering table.

(GB 1,199,036) also discloses a twin-wire dewatering unit with a vertically adjustable upper dewatering table.



Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Hug whose telephone number is (571) 272-1192.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571 272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Eric Hug/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791